

THE BLOOMFIELD CITIZEN.

Republican National Nominations:
For President.
GENERAL BENJAMIN HARRISON.
Of Indiana.
For Vice-President.
LEVI PARSONS MORTON.
Of New York.

Defenders of American Industry.

WE MUST NOW PLACE OUR MANUFACTURERS BY THE SIDE OF THE AGRICULTURIST. . . . EXPERIENCE HAS TAUGHT ME THAT MANUFACTURES ARE NOW AS NECESSARY TO OUR INDEPENDENCE AS TO OUR COMFORT.—Thomas Jefferson, 1816.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 4, 1888.

The Difference.

Much of current political discussion is of that nebulous sort which is intended to confuse, rather than to instruct the voters. An appeal to the prejudices of mankind is a quicker process than an able argument addressed to their intellects. It is not to be wondered at that the essential issue at stake is lost sight of as a political campaign advances, and the oratory becomes more passionate and reckless.

To the average man, a reduction of the tariff, whether made by Republicans or Democrats, is merely a reduction of the tariff. Few men have the education or the expert knowledge to determine the necessities of a forty, fifty or sixty per cent duty upon any given manufactured product. Each man's sympathies naturally go with the party with which he has been allied in the past. His inclination is to intrust the work of reduction to his party friends.

Yet there is an essential difference between parties as at present organized. There is a principle involved even in so apparently simple a matter as a change of duties upon imported goods.

The only free trade country in the world to-day is England. The revenue required for the payment of the current expense is derived from an import tax upon wines, spirits, tea and tobacco, and an internal tax upon incomes, and spirits produced at home. It will be seen that the import tax is no protection at all to her manufacturers. They are compelled to meet the competition of the world. Upon the other hand, Germany and France collect high rates of duty upon goods not manufactured in these countries. These duties afford protection from the cheaper goods of England and Holland.

Between these two systems, the one levying heavy duties upon spirits, wines, tobacco and tea, leaving trade in other articles untrammeled and known as free trade; and the other levying duties upon a large number of manufactured products for the protection of home industry, there is so wide a difference that the dullest voter can understand the issue. It is only when the partisan undertakes a step in the direction of his favorite goal, free-trade, that he begins to dissemble. He dares not make the change at once, so he shapes his policy in such a way as to reach the end by easy stages. But whether the country goes slowly or swiftly the result is the same: the duty upon manufactured goods is taken off, industries which have struggled long for existence are smothered in the competition with the cheap goods of European countries, labor is degraded, and the business of the whole country is prostrated.

Advocates of free trade tell us it is a wise financial system, and so it is for England, where labor is cheap, capital abundant, manufacturers well established. But for America there must be protection, wisely directed to the support of the still struggling industries, until improved machinery, cheap labor, and capital shall make it possible to compete with the industries of the world.

There is then a difference in the tariffs advocated by the two political parties. There is also a difference in the men who compose these parties. The debates in Congress have sufficiently settled the fact that the great Southern wing of the Democratic party is as much free-trade as it was pro-slavery before the War. Upon the other hand the Republican party is the party of protection to home industries. It can honestly appeal to the laboring men to support it in its present struggle to save the country from ruined industries, cheap labor, and cheap men.

Under Way.

Dodd's Hall was filled last Monday evening with as intelligent an audience as one often sees gathered together, even in the very intelligent town of Bloomfield, to listen to Mr. Coul's exposition of Republican principles. The mere fact that the Republicans were able to gather such an audience at this very early stage of the campaign, shows the interest which exists in its issues. Such a gathering at this time stamps as both

false and foolish the claim that politics are of interest only to politicians. The issues this year in very truth come home to every man and woman.

Mr. Coul held the attention of his audience for an hour and a half—the interest at the close being greater than at the beginning. This proves two things, first that Mr. Coul made a very good speech, and in the second place that he had a very appreciative audience.

The work of the newly organized Campaign Glee Club was fine and added very much to the entertainment of the audience. We are confident that their good work was thoroughly appreciated, and doubt not that their inspiring music will add many a vote to the Republican column this fall. The meeting was a great success, and the campaign may be said to be fairly under way.

AN ADDRESS TO FREE-TRADERS.

BEFORE THE COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF NEW YORK, DECEMBER 19, 1887, BY ROBERT P. PORTER.

[In response to a speech made by Mr. R. B. Porter, Secretary of the New York Free Trade Commission, in which he took strong grounds in support of the President's Message, declaring that the President had at last clearly defined the issue between Free Trade and Protection and welcoming the coming economic battle.]

Concluded.

It has been truly said by a writer in the *North American Review* that the President presents the weakest side of the free trade argument. And this is true, "in comprehension as in courage" this writer says, "he resembles the school-boy. Dogmatic and positive where a competent free-trader would be most vague and cautious, he discharges obsolete and long abandoned theories which resemble economic arms of precision no more than a Queen Anne blunderbuss resembles a modern Lebel rifle."

That he has "betrayed a melancholy and hopeless ignorance" of facts there can be no doubt. And that his argument is built upon the proposition that prices of protected products are, as a rule, enhanced to the full extent of the protective duties, even a free-trader will not deny. Before the people will believe this, our gentlemen will have a good deal of explaining to do. You will not only have to explain the facts which I have laid before you, and which Mr. Charles Heber Clark has laid before you, but you will, as the writer in the *North American Review* says, be cruelly handicapped by his ignorance in another way. You will have "to explain how glassware came to be bought in Pittsburgh for Cunard steamer"; how American bridge-builders secured the contract to put thousands of tons of American steel into an Australian bridge; how Pennsylvania rails went to Mexico, or New Jersey locomotives to Europe, or American mining machinery to British mines in South Africa, and by what miracle it comes to pass that American cottons are sold in Manchester and American cutlery in Sheffield.

Linked with these are the other fallacies that foreign prices would be what they now are if American production were to cease, and that cheaper materials can be had by depending upon foreign supplies. In 1879 an increased demand for iron from this country, amounting to 550,000 tons, actually raised the prices of pig iron in Great Britain 67 per cent, of bar iron 66 per cent, and of some other manufactured kinds 100 per cent, and yet Mr. Cleveland imagines that a demand five or ten times greater, consequent upon a removal of duties, would not lift the foreign price as much as the existing duty of 43 per cent. Similar examples by the hundred could be presented of sudden and fatal rise in the cost of materials, when this country has suffered itself to become dependent upon foreign supplies."

And while you are enveloping these facts with theories for the consumption of the working people the manufacturers will resent the President's statement in regard to enormous dividends and demonstrate, as Mr. Abram S. Hewitt did, how small are their profits by offering to rent his vast mills for a dividend of six per cent. If you stand firm by the text of this extraordinary message, you will have to work hard. The people of this land want the facts about the tariff. You can't humbug them with your "ninety per cent ad valorem on blankets," and "eighty per cent on clothing." They understand that over sixty per cent of their income goes for food, which is cheaper here than anywhere on earth; and they also know that the average of seventeen per cent of their income which is expended on clothing can be laid out to good advantage in the New York market as in the London market. They also know that the development of these great industries under a protective tariff has had much to do with developing all commodities that enter into general consumption.

What is true of wool applies with equal force to the other articles proposed for the free list, but which the President does not specifically mention. It will be a fatal mistake to put iron ore, coal, manufactured lumber, salt or flux upon the free list. Under the tariff, the iron ore product has increased from 1,000,000 to 10,000,000 tons annually. Mr. George H. Ely, of Cleveland, told me the other day that, including the investments for distribution (railroads, vessels, etc.), not less than \$150,000,000 of capital was invested in this industry. We are now importing 1,000,000 tons. Take the duty off, and either the wages of miners must be reduced or development stop. I contend that it is better for this country to pay a good deal higher for its ore, its coal, its pig-iron, its iron and steel, than to

bring about either one of these catastrophes.

If I had the time, and you gentlemen had the patience, I could take up every one of these American industries and show what has been accomplished under this protective system. Free-traders and revenue reformers admit all this. But there is a broader view of the subject which the President apparently has not thought of. He looks at this question in spots through a microscope, and fancies he sees all manner of dreadful things. It is not a question simply of whether we shall clothe ourselves in cloths manufactured from American wool, or in cloths fabricated from Australian wool, but how will the nation at large and the individual citizen be affected by the policy which makes the latter necessary, if not inevitable. This is the position taken by the minority of the Ways and Means Committee in 1886, when the question of free wool was before the committee. It is not the narrow question that committee contended of the cost of the clothes we wear, or the food we eat, or the lumber which gives shelter to our homes; but what will be the general effect of such reduced cost, and all which must follow it, upon our citizenship, and ultimately, its influence upon the strength and character of our institutions. The government, which derives all its powers from the people, must be mindful of their interests, considerate of their character, and in every way possible favor their preparation for the responsibilities with which they are charged. It is a broader question than the price of the foreign or the domestic product. I submit the following five propositions for consideration:

I. A nation should make what it can make cheaper than it can buy it.

II. The cost of a thing is what we part with to obtain it.

III. A nation parts with raw materials when she devotes them to productive manipulation, thus using them up.

IV. A nation does not part with her capital or her labor. Their productive employment costs her no more than their idleness.

V. Therefore, the only element of cost in domestic production—so far as concerns the producing nation—is the nature of the materials used; their value, that is, to the nation in their natural site and condition. Comparing the condition of the nation at the inception of the act of production with its condition at the completion of the act, the only difference due to the act that can be discovered is the impairment of her natural resources.

Thus with sufficient spare capital, and sufficient spare labor, it pays us to do our own manufacturing, even at an enhanced cost to the individual—that is, it pays the nation.

And now one word on the President's second proposal to reduce duties, as a means of cheapening commodities and decreasing revenue. No specific schedules are mentioned, so there is doubt as to which schedules he would adopt. Is it the iron and steel schedule? If so, has he taken into consideration that last year nearly \$50,000,000 worth of foreign iron and steel products came into this market. The woolen schedule, with \$40,000,000 of foreign products; the silk schedule, with \$30,000,000; the cotton schedule, with \$30,000,000 and the flax and hemp schedule with \$31,600,000. A few years ago I made an estimate showing that in four years ending 1884 \$1,204,000,000 worth of imported manufactured goods had been imported in this country that should have been made here, something like \$240,000,000 annually. The duties on these goods aggregate nearly \$100,000,000 annually. There is no reason why we should not ourselves produce these important articles of manufacture. With abundant coal and iron ore, we have no right to go to foreign countries annually for one sixth of our supply of iron and steel. The greatest cotton-producing country in the world, and the most ingenious in the use of machinery, has no right to buy nearly \$30,000,000 worth of the manufactures of this same cotton of other nations. The third great wool-producing country of the world should not stand idly by and pay foreign labor and foreign capital for one sixth of what it uses of these goods, and mostly goods into which the greatest amount of labor has gone. Our tin-plated factories are silent, while England supplies us with the goods, and puts up the price by a combination with French producers. Including those that come in free, one third of our annual supply of chemicals come from Europe; four times the value of our total flux products is imported: one third of our glassware, and one half of our earthenware and china.

And, in the face of this, there are people foolish enough to talk of American manufacturers being able to compete with the manufacturers of the world. In some lines, especially in articles of universal consumption, perhaps we can; but these figures do not indicate that we can in the higher grades of goods in the principal protected industries. Here we have in five years \$1,200,000,000 worth of manufactured goods that ought to have been made here. What does this mean to the workingman of the United States, supposing we could have made all these goods at home? At least fifty per cent of this was labor, for the goods that come in under our present tariff are, as a rule, the finer class of goods, in the making of which a large amount of labor is consumed. At least fifty per cent of this is labor, I repeat. The American workman has lost \$600,000,000, or over \$120,000,000 every year in wages. Supposing that mythical and soulless person known to political economists as the "consumer" has been able to get these goods ten per cent cheaper, the nation, as I have clearly shown, has lost ten times ten per cent in not employing her idle labor and surplus capital. While there is land to build factories upon,

capital to stock them and hands to run them, it is a sin not to make all we can at home. It costs the nation nothing but the impairment of its natural resources.

The working people of this country, in my opinion, are far more likely to demand a higher rate of duty, so that more of these imported goods can be made at home, than a lower rate, so that more can be made abroad. If one of our leading statesmen would ably and vigorously go before the country on a platform pledging a tariff high enough to really protect American wage earners, it would sweep the country. That is more likely to be the cry of the future here than that of lower duties. Why, even a free-trade economist like Prof. F. A. Walker admits that we are on the eve of a great protection revival, and that the all-sufficiency of competition as a plea for grinding down the wages of Manchester, England, for the sole purpose of grinding down the wages of their mill operatives. And that system is now advocated squarely by the President of the United States. Ignorance is no excuse for advocating a system that would destroy American industries and pauperize American labor. For advocating a system which acknowledges laissez faire as an excuse for doing nothing while people starve, and the all-sufficiency of competition as a plea for grinding the poor. Though you gentlemen may raise the cry that only free-traders are Christians, we still contend that common-sense and Christian precept are part of our economic faith. All that is best in human nature should have its place in economic life. Man is not a machine, and until he becomes one, you can never apply with success the principle of the old Manchester school of political economists upon his action. In this broad domain of ours there is yet plenty for human hands to do. The more diversified that employment is, the better for the Nation. We are called upon to deal with the economic conditions of this country, not of the world at large, as some of you gentlemen seem to imagine. We must judge of what is best for our own country at this time, and the sooner you divest yourselves of play-ought theories, and take up living facts, the better for the country, and as a country like our own cannot become rich and prosperous without the inhabitants improving their condition, the better for yourselves.

originated by the manufacturers of Manchester, England, for the sole purpose of grinding down the wages of their mill operatives.

The working people of this country, in my opinion, are far more likely to demand a higher rate of duty, so that more of these imported goods can be made at home, than a lower rate, so that more can be made abroad. If one of our leading statesmen would ably and vigorously go before the country on a platform pledging a tariff high enough to really protect American wage earners, it would sweep the country. That is more likely to be the cry of the future here than that of lower duties. Why, even a free-trade economist like Prof. F. A. Walker admits that we are on the eve of a great protection revival, and that the all-sufficiency of competition as a plea for grinding down the wages of Manchester, England, for the sole purpose of grinding down the wages of their mill operatives.

PIANOS, ORGANS.

TELEPHONE 708.

S. D. LAUTER CO.,
657 & 659 BROAD ST., NEWARK, N. J.,
The Largest Piano and Organ House in New Jersey,
COMPLETELY FILLED WITH

Pianos and Parlor Organs of all Best Makers.

Steinway & Sons.
E. Gabler & Bro.
Vose & Son,
Emerson,
And all Best Makers of

PIANOS.
FOR CASH OR SMALL MONTHLY PAYMENTS.
Upright and Square Pianos, let and Rent Applied if Purchased. Pianos \$5 to \$10 Monthly until paid for, and Delivered Free of Charge upon first payment.

Examine the celebrated ERNEST GABLER & BRO. Patent Model
Frave Upright Piano—the best upright piano manufactured.

FRAZEE, CONNET & CO.,

CENTRAL DRY GOODS STORE,

Nos. 657 and 659 Broad Street, Newark.

SEASONABLE MIDSUMMER FABRICS

Summer Silks, French Printed Challies,

FRENCH SATINES, FINE GINGHAM,

AND JONES' WHITE GOODS,

ALL AT GREATLY REDUCED PRICES. SPECIAL SALE OF

Silkines and Challie Remnants.

Special Bargains in Wash Dress Patterns on centre table.

*New Jersey
Business
College.*

764 and 766 Broad St.
NEWARK, N. J.

DAY and EVENING Sessions, both SEXES educated for BUSINESS PENNALSHP, BOOK-KEEPING, ARITHMETIC, SPELLING, CORRECTED, PRACTICAL LAW, COMMERCIAL LAW, ETC. Tuition low. Refer to the hundred students now in Business. New and beautiful Catalogues free. Recruitments every week.

C. T. MILLER,
Principal.

*COLEMAN
Business
COLLEGE, Newark, N. J.*
BOYS, MIDDLE AGED MEN AND YOUNG LADIES. Trained for a successful start in business life at Coleman College, 707 to 713 Broad St. Newark, N. J.

The largest and most popular school in the country. Course of study combines theory with practical work. Tuition low. Tuition based on real values. No vacations. Rates low. Graduates assisted to situations. Coleman College and Illustrated Catalogue mailed on application.

C. T. MILLER, Principal.

H. & C. G. FRITZ,

CARPENTERS AND BUILDERS.
Office and Shop,

FARRAND ST., Bloomfield.

Post Office Address, Box 362, Bloomfield.

Building Contracts Taken. Old Buildings

Remodeled and Removed.

ESTIMATES CHEERFULLY FURNISHED.

E. D. ACKERMAN,
Sanitary Plumber, Steam and Gas Fitter.

Tin, Copper and Sheet Iron Work.

Portable and Brick-set FURNACES, STOVES, RANGES & HEATERS.

Only first-class work done. Jobbing promptly attended to. Estimates cheerfully given.

GLENWOOD AVE. Near the Centre. BLOOMFIELD.

Go to *Cilbert & Taylor's*

For the Best Quality of Well Screened

LEHIGH COAL.

Also, Lackawanna or Free Burning Coal.

SEASONED OAK & HICKORY WOOD,

Sawed and Split.

Parties purchasing in quantities would do well to get our prices before going elsewhere.

Gilbert & Taylor, P. O. Box 30, Bloomfield, N. J.

Office, at Yard, foot of Beach street, on the Canal, and at T. D. Cooper's

next to Post Office, Bloomfield, N. J. Telephone No. 87 B.

SUMMER HORSE GOODS

Fine Harness and Riding Equipments.

CARRIAGES.